

1 HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP  
2 Mark D. Erickson (Bar No. 104403)  
mark.erickson@haynesboone.com  
3 Kevin A. Crisp (Bar No. 261023)  
kevin.crisp@haynesboone.com  
4 600 Anton Boulevard, Suite 700  
Costa Mesa, California 92626  
Telephone: (949) 202-3000  
5 Facsimile: (949) 202-3001

6 Attorneys for Respondent  
Latham & Watkins LLP  
7

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 In re BANC OF CALIFORNIA  
11 SECURITIES LITIGATION  
12

13 This Document Relates To:  
14

15 ALL ACTIONS.  
16  
17

Case No. 8:17-cv-00118-DMG  
(DFMx)

**CLASS ACTION**

**RESPONSE OF LATHAM &  
WATKINS LLP TO STEVEN A.  
SUGARMAN'S OBJECTION TO  
MUDDY WATERS CAPITAL  
LLC'S INTENTION TO  
DISCONTINUE SEEKING A  
MONETARY AWARD AGAINST  
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP**

Judge: Hon. Dolly M. Gee  
Courtroom: 8C

1           Latham & Watkins LLP responds as follows to Steven A. Sugarman's  
2 Objection to the Notice of Muddy Waters Capital LLC's Intention to Discontinue  
3 Seeking a Monetary Award Against Latham & Watkins LLP (respectively, the  
4 "Objection" and the "Notice") (Docket Numbers 670 and 669). Specifically,  
5 Latham writes to make five brief points, including that it does not object to the Court  
6 compelling Latham's disclosure of the settlement agreement subject to the terms of  
7 the existing protective order.

8           First, although Latham is ethically constrained as to what it can say in this  
9 response, Latham wants to assure the Court and Mr. Sugarman that Latham has at  
10 all times complied with its ethical duties to Mr. Sugarman. That includes Latham's  
11 conduct in connection with the negotiation and execution of the settlement  
12 agreement that is the subject of the Notice and Objection. Just as importantly, when  
13 it comes to the underlying contempt motion in general and the settlement agreement  
14 in particular, Latham has not acted *adversely* to Mr. Sugarman under California's  
15 rules of ethics.

16           Second, Mr. Sugarman and Latham have been represented by separate counsel  
17 throughout Muddy Waters' contempt motion and request for sanctions. Mr.  
18 Sugarman has been and continues to be represented by Michelman & Robinson LLP.  
19 Latham has represented itself until this response and is now represented by Haynes  
20 and Boone LLP.

21           Third, contrary to the contention in the Objection, Latham does not seek to  
22 undo or to otherwise modify the Court's contempt order against it. *Cf.* Docket 670  
23 at 5. Indeed, Muddy Waters' Notice expressly "requests that the Court . . . leave the  
24 September 30, 2024 order finding Latham and Sugarman in contempt in place in its  
25 entirety." Docket 669 at 2:19-21.

26           Fourth, Latham has not done anything to deny Mr. Sugarman his right to seek  
27 offset with respect to the fees and expenses, if any, awarded to Muddy Waters on  
28 the pending sanctions motion. Nor has Latham taken any steps to deny

1 Mr. Sugarman his right to seek contribution against Latham. In short, Mr. Sugarman  
2 retains his full suite of rights under California and federal law as to both Muddy  
3 Waters and Latham. And Latham has no objection to Mr. Sugarman's enforcement  
4 of those rights.

5 Fifth, Latham has no objection to the disclosure of the settlement agreement,  
6 subject to it being designated Confidential under the terms of the existing protective  
7 order, either through Muddy Waters' consent (although Muddy Waters has given  
8 Latham notice that it currently objects to disclosure) or pursuant to Court order.

9  
10 DATED: June 13, 2025

HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP

11  
12 By:/s/ Mark D. Erickson  
13 Mark D. Erickson  
14 Attorneys for Respondent  
15 Latham & Watkins LLP  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28